

The Special/Study Meeting of the Troy City Planning Commission was called to order by Chairman Chamberlain at 7:30 P.M. on Tuesday, October 23, 2001 in the Lower Level Conference Room of the Troy City Hall.

1. ROLL CALL

**Present:**

Chamberlain  
Kramer  
Pennington  
Starr  
Storrs (arrived 7:35)

**Absent**

Littman  
Reece  
Waller  
Wright (departed 7:40)

**Also Present:**

Mark Miller, Interim Planning Director  
Susan Lancaster, Assistant City Attorney  
Jordan Keoleian, Student Representative  
Doug Smith, Real Estate and Development Director

2. MINUTES

Moved by: Mr. Kramer

Seconded by: Mr. Wright

RESOLVED to approve the September 25, 2001 Planning Commission Special / Study Meeting Minutes.

**Yeas:**

All Present (5)

**Absent:**

Littman  
Reece  
Storrs  
Waller

RESOLUTION APPROVED

Moved by: Mr. Kramer

Seconded by: Mr. Wright

RESOLVED to approved the October 2, 2001 Planning Commission Regular Meeting Minutes were approved.

Yeas:

All Present (5)

Absent:

Littman  
Reece  
Storrs  
Waller

RESOLUTION APPROVED

Mr. Storrs arrived at 7:30 P.M. and Mr. Wright departed at 7:40 P.M.

**STUDY ITEMS**

3. BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS REPORT

Mr. Storrs stated there was no report at this time.

At this time, Mr. Chamberlain asked for a resolution to excuse Mr. Waller, Mr. Reece, Mr. Littman, and Mr. Wright.

RESOLVED, that Mr. Dave Waller, Mr. James Reece, Mr. Lawrence Littman, and Mr. Wayne Wright, be excused from attendance at this meeting.

Moved by: Ms. Pennington

Seconded by: Mr. Starr

Yeas:

All Present (5)

Absent:

Wright (excused at 7:40 p.m.)  
Littman  
Reece  
Waller

RESOLUTION APPROVED

#### 4. CURRENT DEVELOPMENT REPORT

Mr. Miller stated that Staff has been working with SDS/Wireless, TrinTel, who are currently offering a free service, which the City is utilizing. City Staff has been working with TrinTel to inventory all of the wireless communication antennas in the City. This has been completed and we are now going to examine the gaps in services. Staff wanted to notify the Planning Commission of this study and Mr. Miller asked if the Planning Commission wanted this item discussed at another Special Study Meeting.

Mr. Chamberlain stated that the service providers will select their locations and if directed by the Planning Commission, would cause the city to take ownership and accept responsibility for the wireless communication towers.

Doug Smith, Real Estate and Development Director, stated that he has met with IKEA on a weekly basis regarding the southeast corner of Rochester Road and Big Beaver Road. IKEA is going to ask City Council for a consensus vote. IKEA would then go through the normal rezoning process. IKEA has agreed to redesign the building and provide additional masonry building materials.

Mr. Chamberlain asked how this would be enforceable.

Mr. Smith stated that we will work with them and City Council. That is a commitment on IKEA's part.

Mr. Chamberlain asked what is the timeline.

Mr. Smith stated 2002, depending mainly on the approval process. IKEA currently has all the property under contract.

Mr. Chamberlain asked if we would see it first.

Mr. Smith answered yes. If Council agrees to the development concept, it will come back to the Planning Commission.

Mr. Smith stated that Midtown Square has sold 60 units in 60 days. The remaining units will be ready for occupancy approximately in the January/February timeframe.

Mr. Smith stated that at the City Council study session, approval was granted for an economic feasibility study for the Civic Center. This will be prepared by experts in conferencing and tourism. The RFP is due this Friday, October 25, 2001. Award would be made sometime in November and the initial report should be back in January. These experts all have great experience in the Metro Detroit market.

Mr. Smith further stated that Big Beaver Road, east of I-75, should be opened for traffic the first week of November. There was a bonus provision in the contract for finishing early and the project is approximately three weeks ahead of schedule. There have been problems with the Livernois area between Wattles and Long Lake and will probably be ready mid to late November.

Mr. Smith said he is working on trying to improve the Troy-Oakland Airport with connection to Meijer Drive and lengthen the runway.

Mr. Chamberlain asked who owns Meijer Drive.

Mr. Smith stated that the southern half is owned by the City of Royal Oak and the City of Troy owns the North portion.

Mr. Chamberlain asked if there were any plans to fix Meijer Drive.

Mr. Smith stated that we are working with Royal Oak for improvements. Staff is working with Detroit Edison to place wires underground.

Mr. Miller stated that the other Big Beaver Road construction project between Cunningham and Adams has experienced several problems and will not be completed this year. Temporary improvements will be made just to get through the winter.

Mr. Chamberlain asked about Livernois and Wattles Roads as to why the City didn't fully build out that intersection.

Mr. Smith stated that he did not know the answer.

Mr. Chamberlain asked why did we spend all that time and money and not put in right turn lanes.

Mr. Smith stated that was a good question and that he will investigate. He further stated that Mark Miller and himself would talk with John Abraham, Traffic Engineer.

Mr. Kramer stated that there is numerous vacant retail space at Coolidge and Maple roads.

Mr. Smith stated that there is activity in all the empty spaces at Mid Town Square. Vacancies are due to the lack of renewals. Partly because of the downturn of the economy and it is having an effect; however, I believe it will be dying down. He stated it as more a short term than long term situation.

Mr. Chamberlain stated it might be because we already have too much commercial.

## 5. DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY REPORT

Mr. Smith stated there is three million dollars in increments designated to pay off the bond. They have gotten an "A" rating. The DDA is looking at a five (5) year capital plan and a mission statement.

Mr. Chamberlain stated that the DDA identified a problem at Big Beaver and Crooks roads regarding the driveways for several small businesses. It is the Planning Commission's charter, not the DDA's charter to address these types of problems. The Planning Commission will start working on these Land Use and Zoning studies.

Mr. Chamberlain further stated that if there is a problem at Big Beaver and Crooks, then there is also a problem at Dequindre and Long Lake Roads. If we are going to do an area study, we should do both locations.

Mr. Smith stated that the DDA agreed that the Planning Commission should tackle the Land Use and Zoning issue; however, the DDA felt they may be able to help financially if resources are needed.

## 6. PROPOSED FUTURE LAND USE PLAN

Mr. Chamberlain had the following comments and proposed changes to the Future Land Use Plan text.

Page 17 – Fill in gap in first paragraph.

Page 19 – Add Natural Features Map.

Page 20 – Last paragraph, change five to four

Page 23 – There is no indication in this plan or on the maps to indicate which sidewalks or paths should be 8', 10', or more in width. Create a legend to identify the widths of the sidewalks, bicycle or safety paths.

Mr. Kramer stated City Council already identified sidewalks on all major thoroughfares. He stated that as part of the plan, we should identify what gaps are needed to fill in the needed site plans.

Mr. Chamberlain commented on the Transportation Plan, stating that the key should be changed to indicate the size of the safety paths. Further, stated that we should actually indicate the width for the bikeway/walkway widths.

Mr. Storrs stated we still have a bike route through the City; is it incorporated in this plan. He asked if it should be indicated on the Transportation Plan.

Mr. Chamberlain stated it's going to be a bikeway plan, we could reference the bikeway route back to another map as here is the bikeway route

Mr. Starr commented on the phrase "Modified Plan Adopted" and suggested that the terminology be changed.

Mr. Miller stated we need some terminology.

Mr. Chamberlain stated that we should go to the Future Land Use Plan Map and remove the terminology and place it on the Transportation Plan. It should have a different name. We shouldn't be using these maps just to jog staff's memory. What we are saying "Modified Plan Adopted" does not indicate the correct intent.

Mr. Kramer asked if SEMCOG or SMART, is affecting anything on our Transportation Map.

Mr. Miller stated that we should take a closer look at that, although the City is aware that Big Beaver is identified as a "Proposed Rapid Transit Corridor" and proposed location of SpeedLink. SpeedLink is a rubber-tired form of rapid transit initiated and researched by the Metropolitan Affairs Coalition, that would be quicker, easier, and less expensive to install than light rails.

Mr. Chamberlain stated a transit corridor is already indicated.

Mr. Kramer agreed that the transit corridor is identified.

Mr. Storrs asked about the Big Beaver Urban Design Study.

Mr. Miller answered that there was a City Center/Big Beaver Corridor Urban Design Plan prepared in 1988. This Urban Design Plan presented design guidelines to improve the corridor.

Mr. Chamberlain stated we are working on transportation.

Mr. Miller stated that Big Beaver Transit Corridor is a better identifier than Urban Design.

Mr. Kramer commented he agreed, identify transit corridor.

Mr. Smith stated revisions are being made on the transit center of Mid Town Square to correct the location.

Mr. Storrs stated that in earlier discussions on the Urban Design Plan, wasn't it brought up about having a pathway system and landscaping.

Mr. Miller answered yes, and it included road improvements, street lights, crosswalks, etc. It is not transit related, more of a design. Transit corridor is not identified clearly and should be clarified.

### Future Land Use Plan

Mr. Chamberlain stated that the legend should refer to the Natural Features Map. Also, the Modified Plan Adopted should be removed.

Mr. Kramer asked if these maps are ever going to be made available on the City's web site.

Mr. Miller stated the Natural Features Map is currently available and, therefore, the City can load and make any planning documents available.

Mr. Chamberlain stated that we should have all final comments ready for our next Study meeting in November.

Mr. Starr commented there should be an identifier of the City sections. Include a legend to show how to count sections.

Mr. Kramer commented that Mr. Waller had made a comment at a previous meeting regarding expanding the Planned Auto Center. He asked if Mr. Miller commented on this in the agenda explanation.

Mr. Miller stated that the Planning Commission should understand that auto dealerships are a form of retail sales and the enlargement of the center could encourage retail expansion into Light Industrial areas.

Mr. Chamberlain stated that the City had made a conscious decision years ago regarding planned auto dealerships in the middle of light industrial. The problem is, it keeps growing with successful dealerships.

Mr. Miller commented that commercial encroachment could result from this. Mr. Miller also stated that Mr. Waller's recommendation was to expand the Planned Auto Center to Axtell Street and that would include some B-3 zoning classifications.

Mr. Starr stated that the Planned Auto Center would be outside of Light Industrial areas and merge with commercial zoning classifications.

Mr. Storrs recommended not to enlarge the center and square it off.

Mr. Kramer stated Hollywood Market is next to the auto dealership.

Mr. Chamberlain commented that Hollywood Market is kind of the odd man out.

Mr. Storrs stated that we shouldn't show that finger.

Mr. Chamberlain stated we should scale it back and get rid of the finger and square off and not go to Axtell. Further, stated that we will bring this back in our November Study meeting and get this together and get ready for a public hearing to be held during the January regular meeting.

#### Draft Natural Features and Wetland Ordinances

Mr. Storrs stated that Natural Features' letters went out to all the property owners. Did the City send itself a letter. Is the City ready to live with this and go through all the opposition. The biggest impact would be to the Parks and Recreation Department.

#### 7. LAND USE AND ZONING STUDY – Crooks Road at Big Beaver Road

Mr. Miller stated that at the most recent Downtown Development Authority meeting, the existing conditions of the properties at Crooks Road and Big Beaver Road was identified as an area for potential study. The Planning Staff has prepared preliminary study area maps including the future land use designations, zoning and existing land uses. The Planning Department is requesting that the Planning Commission verify the study area and provide preliminary comments. Staff will then conduct further analysis of the study area to identify specific problems and develop recommendations for the November Special/Study Meeting.

Mr. Chamberlain stated he wants to include Dequindre and Long Lake.

Mr. Smith stated that Kelly Services wants to place a traffic light on Butterfield and Crooks. It is scheduled to go before the Road Commission and will more than likely be approved.

#### 8. PROPOSED P.U.D. (PUD-1) – Troy Baptist Church et al, East side of Rochester, South of Hartwig, Section 2

The Troy Baptist Church, Robertson Brothers Company and Franklin Property Corporation have submitted a preliminary proposal for the development of the 80 acre Troy Baptist property on the east side of Rochester Road south of South



Boulevard, within the R-1D Zoning District. This site has approximately a quarter mile of frontage on Rochester Road and extends east from Rochester approximately one half mile. Troy Baptist also owns a series of lots immediately north of the 80-acres site, on the north side of the platted but unopened one half-width Lovell Street right-of-way. The proposed development includes a church complex, an approximate 5-acre area proposed for low rise office use, and approximately 20 acres of residential condominium development. This submittal is considered preliminary due to the incomplete nature of the site plan. City staff recognizes that considerable information has been submitted by the petitioner; however, the site plan is lacking information as required by the Zoning Ordinance, as determined by the Planning Department and other City Staff. Therefore, staff cannot complete a full review or submit the PUD proposal to the Planning Commission for consideration until a complete application is provided by the petitioners.

At your March 27, 2001 Special/Study Meeting this preliminary proposal was presented by the petitioner (minutes enclosed). The Planning Commission generally demonstrated a favorable opinion towards the concept of the PUD proposal. Therefore, the petitioners have moved forward to develop a more complete PUD package and are requesting additional discussions with the Planning Commission.

The issue of the applicability of the PUD provisions to this proposal, have not changed since March of 2001 and are as follows:

- A. Are the predominant uses consistent with the intent of the Master Land Use Plan;
- B. Are the physical features of the proposed development, such as building height and bulk, setbacks, and development density consistent or compatible with the adjacent areas;
- C. Open space and landscaped areas are intended to be a primary feature of the PUD. Is there substantially more open space area than required for typical developments within the underlying Zoning District, recognizing that most of the wetlands, approximately 20 acres, are State regulated and would be preserved to some degree;
- D. Stormwater detention shall be provided in open unfenced basins or underground. The petitioner is proposing detention within the wetlands and no other detention is indicated;
- E. Parking shall meet the Zoning Ordinance standards, which appears to be feasible and ;

- F. It is intended that the PUD will be implemented as a single coordinate and cohesive development.

The Planning Department recommends that the Planning Commission provide input to the petitioners regarding the proposed PUD. Then, City Staff can meet with developer and clarify specifically the necessary revisions and additional information required. Once the complete information is provided, City Staff can conduct a complete review and submit the proposal to the Planning Commission.

Mr. Chamberlain commented on increasing the height and that we need more site data because the site has expanded from 80 to 90 acres. If we go this route, we are going to need street vacations. We'll require minimal sidewalk provisions. Would like to see a little more effort made for provisions for pedestrians and who will eventually own the wetlands.

Mr. Chamberlain also stated that another issue is the office use being inconsistent with the Master Land Use Plan. This is the biggest question for the Planning Commission. We need to look at that closely and provide some information to the developer. One thing we looked at in this area was residential, and just by itself, the density average is 1.4 units per acre including the wetland. He was also puzzled by the large amount of parking spaces for the church and asked why so many spaces.

Mr. Chamberlain asked if the future Senior Housing is identified to be completed in the future. This will need to be addressed. City Staff requires more detailed information. Further, stated that a PUD shouldn't identify future uses. Any vacant area as approved, will remain vacant. The whole concept of a PUD is that the whole 80 or 90 acres will be a planned development including all uses.

Mr. Chamberlain stated the major issues include; site plan information, encroachment on the north border by other properties, tree preservation, walkability, senior housing, and traffic impact.

Mr. Starr commented that a PUD basically becomes an amendment to the City Ordinances and Charter and that there is no time limit. The future and proposed uses are a problem and should be clarified.

Mr. Chamberlain stated to the petitioner that this is an informal meeting and asked the petitioner when they would be ready to submit for formal consideration.

Andrew Milia, joint petitioner with Troy Baptist, Franklin Properties, and Robertson Brothers were present to answer questions and provide more input. He stated more detailed information was provided and that Mr. Jehle will make a presentation.

Mr. Chamberlain stated he wanted 3-D models before next study meeting, not after.

Mr. Jehle, Robertson Brothers Co. stated that we have acquired all the backyards but two on the north boundary. Rochester Villa is to the south of our site and Alibi restaurant is to the north. There are 89 acres of which Troy Baptist currently sits on 9 ½ acres with 97,000 square feet of church. There will be 140,000 square feet of church in second phase. There is an overlapping situation of church services and that is why there is such a large parking area.

Office building area is 40,000 square feet and will be next to the Alibi restaurant.

Since we met with the Planning Commission in March, we have pulled together a series of the prominent brokers that sell homes in the City of Troy to determine what might be possible here and what were their thoughts of residential on Rochester Road. Their opinion is that the office would provide a barrier for residential uses. There will be 142 condominiums.

He further stated that commuting patterns are different for these types of condominiums. There is not the normal peak volumes because the residents don't normally have jobs.

The Church's peak volume is all on Sunday. A pedestrian walkway system is provided, which allows access to the office.

There is also included an environmental trail system in the wetland area.

The stormwater detention is proposed in the wetlands. This can be accomplished with an earth and berm system. In addition, there is consideration to plan for a 10 year storm.

He further stated that Mark Miller and City Staff provided a mailing list of adjacent property owners and we met with the neighbors. As a result of neighbors' input, we moved buildings away from the east property lines. The site plan in the notebook is the most recent version.

Mr. Kevin Johnson, Troy Baptist Church, presented the Church's proposed building elevations and site plan. He added that there are three separate Church services held on Sunday and that each service is represented by 2,100 to 2,300 people at a time.

Mr. Chamberlain stated that everything that is to be built will be shown on the PUD documents and site plan. We want to see it all right now. That's what a PUD is all about.

Mr. Johnson stated that they do not have the proposed senior housing. He also commented on protecting landmark trees and reviewed floor plans and site plans. He stated there will be a preschool area, and 1,150 parking spaces. Further he stated that the problem is the congregation's size. We've looked at what we need to do in this phase to accommodate our congregation now and 20 years from now.

Mr. Chamberlain stated that on Rochester Road, the entrances need to accommodate pedestrian access. Walkways are needed on both sides and one right through the middle of the parking lot, so that pedestrians have safe access. He recommended that the final plans should have considerable sidewalks to access the facilities. Rochester Road sidewalks and connection to Emerald Lakes is necessary for pedestrians. Troy is trying to become a walkable community, with pedestrian safety as being very important.

Mr. Kramer asked for pedestrian connection to Emerald Lakes.

Further he stated, paths should provide access through the flood plains and wetland areas. He asked if this would be usable at all times without flooding.

Mr. Jehle stated the walkway would be designed so it will not be under water; therefore, making it usable.

Mr. Jehle stated that soil conditions and water levels are bad but that most of these condominiums will have basements.

Mr. Kramer commented that he knows the petitioner's will meet the City and State codes relative to fire safety, but will sprinklers be used.

Mr. Jehle stated that the use of block common walls will stop fires between units.

Mr. Kramer stated that the Cherry Hill development built by Biltmore, have sprinklers in the townhouses.

Mr. Robertson stated that with 28 years experience, masonry wall works. If we used sprinklers, there would be no solid wall and then no sound barrier. The wall goes all the way to the roof. Robertson has had fabulous acceptance from residents and is good soundproofing and fire proofing.

Mr. Storrs stated he was still concerned about traffic on south side of the site. He would like to see the primary traffic flow be away from the Rochester Villas.

Mr. Johnston stated that the main entrance will be one way in and one way out.

Mr. Storrs stated that there are a lot of activities, i.e., athletic field, gym, etc. Primary goal is the traffic flow right behind the units that I am concerned about.

He also stated he was concerned about the office and that we have residential across Rochester.

Mr. Chamberlain asked the petitioners when they were planning on bringing this in front of the city.

Mr. Jehle stated 30 days.

Mr. Chamberlain stated he does not want to see any walls with footings that may kill off trees, use pilings to save trees.

Mr. Kramer commented that if we don't see any lights on the soccer field, we can interpret that to mean there won't be any lights on the soccer field in the future. A lighting plan should be provided and should not impact the neighbors.

Mr. Jehle asked what would the requirements be for walls and fencing if we could do it under a PUD. Would prefer to use landscaping rather than walls.

Mr. Chamberlain stated wherever you are required to put a fence, we don't want one with footings. Another concern, is the residential and the lack of sidewalks. The Future Land Use Plan is trying to make Troy a walkable community. We would like to see sidewalks on both sides of the residential road.

Mr. Robertson stated they have looked at sidewalks, but they will reduce the open space and some of the natural features. In the course of their experience since 1973, they have found that this type of market does not need sidewalks. Also, the trip generation is very low so sidewalks aren't necessary.

Mr. Chamberlain stated that in his opinion sidewalks are to be required on both sides of the road.

Mr. Miller commented that the City Traffic Engineer wants a Traffic Impact Study.

Mr. Chamberlain stated that he does not see the Planning Commission being ready to hear this in 30 days.

Mr. Storrs asked if there is going to be pedestrian access to Emerald Lakes and Eister and Suburban Homes Subdivisions.

Mr. Jehle stated yes, they can do pedestrian access.

Mr. Robertson asked if the Planning Commission would consider the December meeting.

Mr. Chamberlain stated that it will not be easy to make December. It will probably be tabled until January.

Mr. Robertson stated their development proposals can always get tabled.

Mr. Chamberlain commented that if we don't set that public hearing, we are going to be really behind. He also stated that City Staff needs a traffic impact statement. He further stated that we could tentatively set this for December and he also questioned the timeframe that notices need to go out to the public before the public hearing.

Mr. Miller commented notice needs to be given 5-15 days prior to the meeting.

Mr. Chamberlain stated that the petitioners need to get with Mr. Miller to provide 3D models of the whole site. Mr. Miller will talk with you about that.

Mr. Storrs commented that back in March we discussed reasons on why we think there should be a PUD here. He also asked why there is an office use.

Mr. Robertson answered that it is a double edge situation that we are dealing with. No one wants the church next to a bar. Robertson doesn't want residential on Rochester Road. Therefore, the office building will look very residential and will fit right in with the proposed uses.

Mr. Storrs stated that it's not how the office building would look or function, the problem is zoning. It creates a zoning problem across Rochester.

Ms. Lancaster commented on the Rabbani zoning litigation, where O-1 was denied by the City and this PUD could affect this case.

## 9. PUBLIC COMMENT

Ian Coffey, 1146 Hartwig, stated his concern over the PUD. He has been at every meeting with Troy Baptist. He stated his concern over the density and traffic problems. Traffic in that area is already bumper to bumper from approximately 5:15 to 6:00 P.M. Setbacks are a problem. Troy Baptist originally stated in the infancy of this project that they were not going to build a lot of units. Then the second meeting they presented a clubhouse. He stated concern about having a condominium complex next to his back yard. His neighbors feel the same about the project. There is not a lot of setback when comparing houses and condominiums. His opinion was that his property value is going to be reduced.

Mr. Johnston, Troy Baptist Church, stated that he was approached by a cell phone company. He asked for the Planning Commission's opinion and comments about placing a cell phone tower on their property.

Mr. Chamberlain remarked that Mr. Johnston should look at the ordinance requirements.

Mr. Miller stated that if the antennae was placed on the Church as opposed to a free standing tower, only a building permit is required.

Mr. Starr stated it could be integrated into the church steeple

PUBLIC COMMENT CLOSED

GOOD OF THE ORDER

Mr. Miller commented to the members going to the Michigan Society of Planning Conference and to make sure all receipts are in order and keep track of all mileage.

Mr. Kramer stated he could make available the site plans from Cherry Hill Village if anyone was interested. He questioned if this will survive ten years from now.

Mr. Chamberlain stated that this is our first PUD and we have to do it right. The Planning Commission and Planning Department should not be rushed because mistakes cannot be made.

MEETING ADJOURNED 9:45 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Mark F. Miller  
Interim Planning Director